

assumption variables in the study, and it would continue to protect a number of its product lines where the U.S. stands to gain the most from market access. The proposal of the G-20 group would yield an extra \$7.5 billion per year, a bare minimum.

Moreover, the benefit to U.S. production agriculture from increased earnings under the U.S. proposal would provide latitude for writers of the next farm bill to adjust domestic programs to accommodate two important realities. Some of our domestic programs have been ruled trade-distorting under the WTO. Ultimately we will have to reform these programs. Either we change our farm programs now by negotiation in the WTO where we can get something in return for them, or we will be forced to change them by litigation by which we don't get anything for them. Here is the perfect opportunity, where we can gain market access and income to offset changes made domestically.

The second reality is the cost of farm programs. That cost may not seem like much in years of little budget competition. But today we are in a budgetary climate where any policy that depends on government financing is subject for review. There is strong competition for public outlays, and an effort to reduce the deficit places new scrutiny on all programs.

We all have just experienced the budget reconciliation process in Congress. In agriculture, we were obligated to find \$3 billion worth of savings to accommodate budget targets. That is just the beginning, and we are well advised to know the alternatives available to us to make adjustments in important programs in advance of the need. This WTO negotiation provides the U.S. with the opportunity to convert its aggressive proposal for reform into real income for farmers and agribusiness. For instance, if the U.S. program crops like wheat, corn, rice, and soybeans continue to be under pressure in the WTO for the portions of their domestic subsidy programs that "distort" trade, the advent of the next farm bill provides us a chance to convert supports for those crops into a format that conforms to WTO guidelines. In return, we gain the market access from our trading partners to sell them U.S. fruit and vegetables, meat and dairy products, and other specialty crops not previously allowed into their markets in sufficient quantity.

If we don't succeed in opening those opportunities for U.S. agriculture, we will have nothing with which to persuade our producers to give up the expensive domestic subsidies to which they have become accustomed. Another expensive, non-innovative, and divisive farm bill might unfortunately be the result. Mr. President, a great deal is riding on the success of the Doha Round.

#### REPRESENTATIVE JOHN MURTHA'S SPEECH

Mr. AKAKA. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about Representative JOHN MURTHA's statement on Iraq. JOHN MURTHA is right. We need an exit strategy from Iraq. The administration should have had one before the war.

As I and other Members of Congress consistently requested before Operation Iraqi Freedom, OIF, began, it was imperative for the administration to have a plan for both entering and, now more importantly, for exiting Iraq. We are 2 years into OIF with no clear end in sight. There is no excuse for not having one now.

We must provide the Iraqi people with the tools necessary to stand on their own. Only the Iraqi people can rebuild Iraq. Only the Iraqi people can defend Iraq. We cannot do it for them. We cannot want it more than they want it. What we must do is provide them with the means to accomplish this, but what we are unable to do is to give them the will.

Whether we leave Iraq tomorrow, or in 6 months, or longer, the President needs to tell the American people when and how we will be able to withdraw our troops. We cannot afford to lose more Americans in Iraq.

JOHN MURTHA is a great patriotic American. His service in the military and in the U.S. Congress cannot be measured. Those who disparage him tarnish only themselves.

Everyone who knows JOHN MURTHA knows that he believes in his heart and soul in the American military and he will do everything he can to help them. He should be listened to for what he has done, for who he is, and because he is right.

#### NATIONAL SECURITY PERSONNEL SYSTEM REGULATIONS

Mr. INOUE. Mr. President, I am very disappointed with the U.S. Department of Defense and Office of Personnel Management's final regulations for the National Security Personnel System, NSPS, that will affect more than 350,000 defense civil service employees throughout our Nation. What makes the new system dangerous is that upon a cursory glance, it would almost appear "acceptable" in the name of national security. Scratch the surface, however, and it becomes very alarming.

The rhetoric does not match reality. U.S. Defense Secretary Donald Rumsfeld in public testimony stated that these new regulations "would not end collective bargaining," but, rather, would "bring collective bargaining to the national level" to avoid duplication and inefficiency. This has not occurred, nor do I believe there is a sincere interest in the Pentagon to pursue national collective bargaining. In fact, I would suspect that the Pentagon's plan is just the opposite—to substantially remove from the table the num-

ber of subjects for good faith collective bargaining.

For this reason, I am pleased that the employee unions have gone to Federal court to challenge the regulations, in the same fashion that they challenged the Department of Homeland Security regulations. I hope they will prevail in their call for injunctive relief, as they did in the Homeland Security case, as well as to prevail in the final disposition of both cases.

While I would be the first to say that the Federal civil service system is not perfect, it is a system that has withstood the test of time as fair and impartial. To overhaul it in favor of vesting the subjective power to hire, fire, discipline and promote in the hands of a few political appointees is very dangerous. At this point, the "seemingly acceptable" national security rationale for the wholesale stripping of employees' rights fast begins to lose its luster. It is no longer reasonable. There seems to me to be an inherent conflict. In the name of national security, this administration is willing to deny its own workers a small modicum of security—employment and family security—especially when I do not believe it is necessary to achieve our goal of national security. I call into question the motivations behind their actions.

My position on the Pentagon's issuance of the NSPS regulations is what I believe any decent fellow would say: Now is the time for our Nation to come together in support of our armed services abroad. To do so, we must stand behind our civilian defense workforce from whom we are demanding great productivity in support of our troops.

Now is not the time to be divisive and punitive of our Federal workforce. It creates low morale, mistrust, and a decreasing level of respect between worker and management. The consequences stemming from such instability, could be dire. For me, the stakes in terms of human lives are too high to be taking such a gamble. United we stand—civilian and military together. Divided we could fail.

#### NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT

Ms. SNOWE. Mr. President, I rise to speak in favor of my amendment No. 2528, unanimously adopted into the National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2006, to provide targeted size standard relief for small U.S. contractors incurring extraordinary security and protection costs on foreign battlefields in the global war on terror.

Right now, in Iraq and Afghanistan, there are many brave, small contracting businesses working alongside our uniformed soldiers in many cases. Employees of these small contracting firms get shot at and encounter roadside bombs, suicide attacks, ambushes, and kidnappings. Yet, in order to provide our military with desperately needed goods and services, these small